



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,470	07/23/2003	Larry Buenz	2027	1469
31424	7590	08/09/2005	EXAMINER	
BABCOCK IP LLC 24154 LAKESIDE DRIVE LAKE ZURICH, IL 60047			TA, THO DAC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

47

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/604,470	BUENZ ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Tho D. Ta	2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21-26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Locati et al. (5,651,698) in view of Rath (5,302,067).

Locati et al. discloses a coaxial connector, comprising : a connector body 40 connected to a rear clamp nut 10; wherein the connector body 40 and the rear clamp nut 10 are connected via a plurality of single threads.

However, Locati et al. does not disclose that the threads are interleaved concentric threads for advancing the rear clamp nut 10 twice as far per revolution as a single thread.

Rath discloses the multiple interleaved concentric threads in fig. 1, column 2, lines 31-43, for advancing the fastener twice as far per revolution as a single thread.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Locati et al. invention by constructing the threaded portion as disclosed by Rath in order to reduce assembling time.

### *Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant's arguments filed 5/24/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Rath is merely a screw taken from a nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, at best understood, the basic concept of the claimed invention is to construct the threads as the multiple interleaved concentric threads for advancing the fastener twice as far per revolution as a single thread. Locati et al. discloses a coaxial connector, comprising : a connector body 40 connected to a rear clamp nut 10; wherein the connector body 40 and the rear clamp nut 10 are connected via a plurality of single threads. However, Locati et al. does not disclose that the threads are interleaved concentric threads for advancing the rear clamp nut 10 twice as far per revolution as a single thread. Rath discloses the multiple interleaved concentric threads in fig. 1, column 2, lines 31-43, for advancing the fastener twice as far per revolution as a single thread. Thus, the combination of the cited references are proper and analogous.

In response to applicant's argument that reduction of assembly time is an Examiner inference, not a teaching appearing in Rath. It is not necessary that the references actually suggest, expressly or in so many words, the changes or improvements that applicant has made. The test for combining references is what the references as a whole would have suggested to one ordinary skill in the art. In re

Sheckler, 168 USPQ 716 (CCPA 1971); *In re McLaughlin* 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971);  
*In re Young* 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 1-18 are allowed.
5. Claims 21-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: In regard to claims 1, 21, the prior art fails to provide, teach or suggest the cutting edge at the second inner diameter operating to cut and separate the sheath from the outer conductor as the cable is inserted into the bore and rotated. In regard to

claims 10, 22, the prior art fails to provide, teach or suggest the complementary protrusions of the first ring and the second ring interact whereby the connector body is coupled to the inner coupling sleeve during rotation of the connector body via application of a torque below a threshold level.

***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tho D. Ta whose telephone number is (571) 272-2014. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley can be reached on (571) 272-2800 ext 33. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2833

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**THO D. TA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

tdt  
08/04/05